

1 defendant and attempt to remedy any apparent defects of which [he] has knowledge.” *Rochon v.*
2 *Dawson*, 828 F.2d 1107, 1110 (5th Cir. 1987). Here, Plaintiff’s complaint has been pending for
3 over 120 days, and thus, absent a showing of “good cause,” is subject to dismissal without
4 prejudice. *See* Fed. R. Civ. P. 4(m). Because Plaintiff has not provided sufficient information to
5 allow the Marshal to locate and serve Defendant D. Hamilton and Defendant Dutra, Plaintiff
6 must remedy the situation or face dismissal of his claims against Defendant D. Hamilton and
7 Defendant Dutra without prejudice. *See Walker v. Sumner*, 14 F.3d 1415, 1421-22 (9th Cir.
8 1994) (holding prisoner failed to show cause why prison official should not be dismissed under
9 Rule 4(m) where prisoner failed to show he had provided Marshal with sufficient information to
10 effectuate service).

11 Plaintiff must provide the Court with more identification information for Defendant D.
12 Hamilton and Defendant Dutra such that the Marshal is able to effect service. **If Plaintiff fails**
13 **to provide the Court with more identification information for Defendant D. Hamilton and**
14 **Defendant Dutra within thirty (30) days of the date this order is filed, Plaintiff’s claim**
15 **against these Defendants will be dismissed without prejudice pursuant to Rule 4(m) of the**
16 **Federal Rules of Civil Procedure.**

17 IT IS SO ORDERED.

18 DATED: 4/19/13

19 
LUCY H. KOH
United States District Judge